

REMEDIAL ACTION CERTIFICATION FORM
(Please type or print in black ink only)
Instructions for completion on reverse.

1. Site Name and Location: (Street address, County, City and Assessor's parcel number)

State Lands Commission, Tract 23507, *Sections 11, 12, 13, 14 in T3S, R7W

City of Norco, California 91720

Riverside County

- A. List any other names that have been used to identify sites:

Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach Corona Annex; Fleet Administration Center; Naval Weapons Center, China Lake Corona Annex

- B. Address of site if different from above: _____

- C. Assessor's Parcel Numbers: _____

2. Responsible Parties: (Use extra page if necessary.)

Name: Charles Warren

Name: H. Lawrence Garrett

Title: Executive Officer

Title: Secretary of the Navy

Firm: State of California, State Lands Commission

Firm: Department of the Navy, Naval Facilities Engineering Command

Address: _____

Address: _____

1807 13th Street

Post Office Box 727

City: Sacramento, California

City: San Bruno, California

Zip: 95814

Zip: 94066-0720

Telephone: (916) 322-4105

Telephone: () _____

Relationship to site: such as generator, hauler, etc.

Current Landowner/Operator: State of California, State Lands Commission is the current landowner. The property is in escrow to be transferred to Lewis Homes of California.

*Assessors Parcel Numbers (APN) 126-020-003, APN 129-150-011 and a portion of APN 129-150-010 (see attached land descriptions, Attachment 1 & 2)

3. Brief Description and History of the Site: (Include previous and current uses of site, a brief description of the cleanup action and concentrations of significant hazardous substances left on site).

The State Lands Commission (SLC) property was once part of the United States Naval Fleet Analysis Center, Corona Annex. The facility was under the command of the commanding officer of the Naval Weapons Station (NAWPNSTA), located in the city of Seal Beach, Los Angeles County, California. In 1980, the State of California acquired a portion of the land in the Corona Annex in exchange for state-owned lands. In January 1984, more than 300 acres of the Corona Annex, which included the SLC property, were officially declared "excess" by the U.S. Navy and transferred to the General Services Administration (GSA). The U.S. Navy retained about 129 acres of land at the Corona facility, which is currently in operation.

A Initial Assessment Study prepared in 1985 by the U.S. Navy identified various activities involving hazardous materials at the Corona Annex. These activities were: use of chemicals in a research laboratory, painting and printing operations, operations of auto shops, pesticide application, and testing of mechanical and electrical fuses.

The SLC property is unimproved, several dirt roads cross the site, various grasses and native arid vegetation grow at the site. Numerous burrows, open pipes, and pieces of rusted pipes are present at the site. Lewis Homes of California is in escrow to purchase the SLC property and plans to develop it into single-family dwellings.

In May 1989, Kleinfelder, Inc. completed a Preliminary Site Assessment of the property. In October 1989, Kleinfelder conducted a geophysical survey and collected near-surface and subsurface soil samples at the site. Twenty-two trenches were dug, eighteen subsurface soil samples and four near-surface soil samples were collected and analyzed for priority pollutants. Result from the analyses and the geophysical survey do not indicate the presence of hazardous substances at the site. Therefore, no further action is required at the site. Also, verification of the site is justified.

4. Type of Site: (Check appropriate response)

Include in Bond Expenditure Plan?

Yes X No

RCRA-Permitted Facility Bond - funded X

RCRA Facility Closure RP - funded X

*NPL

Federal Facility X

Other (i.e., walk-in): Explain Briefly:

5. Size of Site: (Based on Expenditure Plan definition of size)

Small X Medium _____ Large _____ Extra Large _____

6. Dates of Remedial Action

a. Initiated January, 1989 b. Completed March, 1990

*Per SARA, any NPL site that is not permanently cleaned must be scheduled for a follow-up visit after 5 years to verify that cleanup measures are still satisfactory.

7. Response Action Taken on Site: (check appropriate action)

_____ Initial Removal or Remedial Action (site inspection/sampling)
_____ Final Remedial Action
_____ RCRA enforcement/closure action
X No action, further investigation verified that no cleanup action at site was needed.

A. Type of Remedial Action (e.g. Excavation and redisposal on-site treatment): No Further Action

B. Estimated quantity of waste associated with the site (i.e., tons/gallons/cubic yards) which was:

1. <u>N/A</u> treated	Amount: _____
2. <u>N/A</u> untreated (capped sites)	Amount: _____
3. <u>N/A</u> removed	Amount: _____

8. Cleanup Levels/Standards

a. What were the cleanup standards established by DHS pursuant to the final remedial action plan (RAP) or workplan (if cleanup occurred as the result of a removal action (RA) or interim remedial measures (IRM) prior to development of a RAP)?

Not applicable

b. Were the specified cleanup standards met? Yes _____ No N/A

c. If "no", why not: The site requires NO FURTHER ACTION

9. DHS Involvement in the Remedial Action:

A. Did the Department order the Remedial Action?

Yes _____ No X Date of order _____

B. If yes, did EPA concur with all remedial actions? Yes X No

C. EPA comments: Correspondence dated May 25, 1990 from USEPA to DHS,
referencing a Screening Site Inspection, concluded that no further
remedial action is planned.

EPA staff involved in cleanup: _____
(Name, Title)

(Address, Phone Number)

11. Other Regulatory Agency Involvement in the Cleanup Action:

Agency:	Activity:
<u> </u> RWQCB	<u> </u> None
<u> </u> SCAQMD	<u> </u> None
<u> </u> CHP	<u> </u> None
<u> </u> Caltrans	<u> </u> None
<u> </u> Other	<u> </u> None

Name of contact persons and agency: _____

12. Post-Closure Activities:

- A. Will there be post-closure activities at this site? (e.g. Operation and Maintenance) Yes No X
- B. Have post-closure plans been prepared and approved by the Department? Yes No X
- C. What is the estimated duration of post-closure (including operations and maintenance) activities? years.
- D. Are deed restrictions proposed or in place? Yes No X

If "yes", have deed restrictions been recorded with the County Recorder? Yes No Date

If "no", who is responsible for assuring that the deed restrictions are recorded? _____

Who is the Division contact? _____
(Name/Phone Number)

E. Has cost recovery been initiated? Yes No

If yes, amount received \$ 7,500.00 ; 100 % of DHS costs.
*PEA Fee.

- F. Were local planning agencies notified of the cleanup action?
Yes _____ No _____ If yes, the name and address of agency:

13. Expenditure of Funds and Source:

(Information to be supplied by Toxic Accounting Unit.)

Funding Source and amount expended:

_____ HWCA \$ _____ HSA \$ _____
_____ HSCF \$ _____ RCRA \$ _____
_____ RP \$ _____ X Other \$ 7,500.00 PEA Fee
_____ Federal Cooperative Agreement \$ _____

14. Certification Statement: Based upon the information which is currently and actually know to the Department.

_____ The Department has determined that all appropriate response actions have been completed, that all acceptable engineering practices were implemented and that no further removal/remedial action is necessary.

X The Department has determined, based upon a remedial investigation or site characterization that the site poses no significant threat to public health, welfare or the environment and therefore implementation of removal/remedial measures is not necessary.

_____ The Department has determined that all appropriate removal/remedial actions have been completed and that all acceptable engineering practices were implemented; however, the site requires ongoing operation and maintenance (O&M) and monitoring efforts. The site will be deleted from the "active" site list following (1) a trial operation and maintenance period and (2) execution of a formal written settlement between the Department and the responsible parties, if appropriate. However, the site will be placed on the Department's list of sites undergoing O&M to ensure proper monitoring of long-term clean-up efforts.

15. Additional Comments: _____

16. Certification of Remedial Action:

I hereby certify that the foregoing information is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

1. Wafel Ibrah for Manny Alonzo 6/27/90
Project Manager/ Date
2. Albert A. Avellano, Jr. 6/27/90
Sr. Project Manager/ Date
3. Albert A. Avellano Jr FOR John Scandura 6/27/90
Unit Chief/ Date
4. [Signature] 6/28/90
Regional Administrator/ Date
5. Albert A. Avellano, Jr C18152 6/27/90
Registered Engineer/Geologist Date

REMEDIAL ACTION CERTIFICATION FORM
TRANSMITTAL SHEET

State Lands Commission, Tract 23507, Norco

Name of hazardous waste site or RCRA facility

Waupli 162 for Manny Alonzo

Regional Project Manager

Date

6/27/90

Albert A. Cullane, Jr.

Sr. Project Manager

Date

6/27/90

Albert A. Cullane, Jr. FOR John Scandura
Regional Site Mitigation Unit Chief

Date

6/27/90

Regional Administrator

Date

6/28/90

Please return completed Certification Form to:

_____ Chief, HQ Site Mitigation Planning and Policy Unit